

REMARKS

Responsive to the aforementioned Office letter, the applicant has amended the claims as indicated on the set of claims which accompany this amendment. Each of the claims have been amended to ensure that they are patentably distinct from the claims in the applicants parent patent as well as the subsequent U.S. Patent No. 6,384,736 in order to overcome the double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. The changes made in these claims and the comparison to like claims in the applicant's U.S. Serial No. 6/384,736 B1 is hereinafter described in more detail.

Claims 17 and 18 were allowed. Claim 17 has only been amended to correct a misspelling and to eliminate the terminology "direction" and with regard to the manner in which display is generated. The term "direction" is presumably misleading in the context of the claim, and for this reason only has been deleted.

Claims 19-23 were rejected on the grounds of double patenting of the obviousness type under 35 U.S.C. 103 and can be corrected by a terminal disclaimer. The applicant is therefore herewith submitting its terminal disclaimer along with the necessary terminal disclaimer fee therefor.

A comparison of the dependent claims in this patent will not be made with the dependent claims in the Gothard '736 Patent

inasmuch as changes in the claims on which they depend will inherently change the dependent claims.

Claim 8 of the present application corresponds generally to Claim 1 of the Gothard '736 Patent. However, this claim has deleted reference to the interior compartment and the fact that the display panel, while being relatively thin and high resolution, is not defined as being high definition. This claim has been further amended to recite that the electronic signals from a remote source contain information related to the displays to be generated. Inasmuch as Claims 8-16 now patentably distinguish over corresponding Claims 1-9 of the Gothard '736 Patent, it is believed these claims are free of double patenting.

Claims 24-35 were alleged to be met by Claims 17-28 of the Gothard '736 Patent. Claim 24 of the present application differs from Claim 17 of the Gothard '736 Patent in that Claim 24 no longer calls for a dedicated computer operated processing means. Moreover, this claim calls for the fact that the computer operated processing means is associated with the display sign. Further, the memory means has been recited as being associated with the display sign. Finally, in clause (c), the claim recites that the aforesaid components enable the displays which may comprise advertising and other information. These limitations are not found in Claim 17 and it is therefore believed that Claim 24 and Claims 25-30, which are

dependent thereon, distinguish over Claim 17 and its associated dependent claims.

Claim 31 of the present application appears to correspond generally with Claim 24 of the Gothard '736 Patent. Initially, this claim has been amended in order to eliminate some potential ambiguities. It was noted that clause (c) was generally similar to clause (e). Consequently, clause (c) of Claim 31 of the instant application has been deleted. Moreover, there was apparently some confusion between remote source and remote site. In order to eliminate that ambiguity, the remote source has been defined as a display generating source. Notwithstanding, there have been other changes in Claim 31, such as the fact that clause (c), as now amended, calls for the transmitting of electronic signals to a self-contained computer processing means and which is associated with the display sign. In clause (d), as now amended, the electronic signals are stored in a memory means associated with the computer processing means. Finally, clause (g) has been amended to call for the reconversion of the digital signals into digital images. It is therefore believed that Claims 31-35 now patentably distinguish over Claims 29-33 of the Gothard '736 Patent.

Inasmuch as the applicant has ensured that all claims in this application no longer correspond directly with claims in the Gothard '736 Patent, it is believed that all claims as now

contained in this Amendment B and allowance therefore is respectfully solicited.

It is believed that this amendment should now place the application in allowable condition and favorable reconsideration and allowance therefore is respectfully solicited.

Dated: Amendment 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

  
ROBERT J. SCHAAP  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 20,577  
(818) 346-6555

C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Documents\Data\AdMedia\10010556\Amendment B